

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/088,224

Applicant(s)

PINSON ET AL.

Examiner

SHEW-FEN LIN

Art Unit

2166

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SHEW-FEN LIN.

(3) _____

(2) Eric G. King (Reg. 42,736).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 02 September 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chamoff, Sugiyama.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Shew-Fen Lin/
Examiner, Art Unit 2166

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives explained the invention and prior art. Applicant discussed proposed amendment to clarify the feature of the invention and to distinguish with the existing prior art rejection. It appears that the newly amended limitation, "transmitting... to the peripheral coupler of the satellite system" might still taught by Chamoff, as shown in Fig. 6, items 144 and 146. Examiner suggests further amendment to clarify whether "an operation control block" and/or "an operation data block" are the same or different from the "a first data block" previous cited. For claims 22-23, the limitations "first directional link" and "second directional link" might overcome the prior art rejection. After receiving the official amendment, further search will be conducted.